

Note: This transcript was substantially edited for accuracy, clarity, and legibility by Arnold Cogan and Kevin Pozzi in August of 2015.

Arnold Cogan Interview

Tuesday, 6/23/15

INTERVIEWER: Today is June 23, 2015. It is my pleasure to be talking this afternoon with Arnold Cogan. Among many titles he has held throughout his distinguished career, Arnold was Oregon's first Planning Coordinator under Governor Tom McCall, the first Director of the Department of Land, Conservation and Development, and the first Planning Director for the Port of Portland. Arnold is currently a founding principal at the planning, community outreach and engagement firm Cogan, Owens & Green. My name is Jim Sitzman. I'm a former LCDC field representative and before that managed the process of developing the Portland Metropolitan Urban Growth Boundary. Arnold, we are honored that you would be willing to sit down with us today. We are hoping to gather as much information as we can from the people who were influential in forming and shaping Oregon's land use system. We are aiming to document the stories, anecdotes and experiences of people who are involved back then as well as to get your thoughts on how the system has evolved and where you think it might be headed. We encourage you to share anything you feel is relevant to this effort. Don't hesitate to provide dates and people and events that are important along the way as part of your story. So, let's begin. Arnold, I have a beginning observation to make that in reflecting upon this interview that I figured you must have probably, per square inch of the brain, more information on the 40-year history of this program than anybody I can think of and so we want to get as much of that on tape today as we can. So, to begin with, perhaps you would just sketch in outline form some of the many points of involvement that you've had with the program and then we can backfill.

ARNOLD COGAN: From the very beginning?

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

ARNOLD COGAN: My gosh. My involvement in land use in Oregon began a number of years before the program began here..

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm.

ARNOLD COGAN: I don't think you want to get into all of that.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah. No.

ARNOLD COGAN: I think much of that is --

INTERVIEWER: But just hit the high points.

ARNOLD COGAN: When I began, I came to work for Lloyd Keefe at the Portland City Planning Commission in 1958. It was a while ago, and I'd just gotten out of the Army. At that time there were a number of specific projects. They were central city oriented and so we began working on a number of projects, for example, one was Pioneer Courthouse Square, and I remember the drafting table I had in Lloyd's office, right next to Bob Frasca, who's a partner in an architectural firm of Zimmer, Gunsul & Frasca.

INTERVIEWER: Uh huh.

ARNOLD COGAN: And we laid out the plans for the Pioneer Square. At that time, it was the Meier & Frank's parking lot. I think I don't have to repeat what the history books already show, but that was one of my first planning projects that I worked on for Lloyd. The other one was helping him with the annexation policy that was just taking shape at that time. City of Portland, under Mayor Terry Schrunk at that time, was interested in becoming aggressive about annexing adjacent areas because this was long before anybody thought of urban growth boundaries, but it was simply the areas around the City of Portland that were dependent on the City for water, sewer

and a whole variety of other services. So, those are the kind of early projects that I worked on. Later when I became Planner Director at the Port of Portland in '62, and the Port of Portland at that time was also undergoing quite a bit of change. My first project was to help them create and prepare the plans for the Swan Island Industrial Park. And at that time it was just a tired backwater on the Willamette River, and they were receiving deposits of soil and sand from dredging when the channel was dug. They dumped it over there. Meier & Frank's had warehouses. That was about it. I persuaded the Port Commission to think about the idea of an industrial park, and at that time, the Port Commission couldn't get its arms around the idea of, "What is an industrial park?" So, I had us join the Urban Land Institute and began bringing their periodicals to them. Industrial Parks were really a concept that was sweeping the country, especially in very large cities and doing a good job of developing them. Competing as an industrial center, Portland had never really undertaken much of a marketing program to market its industrial land because for practical purposes what industrial land there was, was just scrap land here and there. We didn't have any real industrial planning and zoning going on at the time. So, regarding such industrial parks, I remember persuading the Port Commission, since they were selling land for about \$2,000 an acre and basically, what I could see with these other cities, I said, "What would you think if we could create an industrial park and you could sell land for \$15,000 an acre?" They said, "You know, it would never happen around here; competitive prices here don't even come close." I said I thought we could. Let's try this industrial park plan. So, we came up with a plan with landscaping standards, noise standards, traffic standards, where people could park their cars and trucks. I got all these ideas from ULI's material, it was just wonderful, because I'd never studied the industrial parks concept -- and who studied that in school? So, it took us about a year and a half and we put our plan together, and I had architectural renderings of it showing the landscaping and we required

each industry to submit their color scheme because we wanted to coordinate their color scheme so that one didn't clash with another. We wanted just a kaleidoscope of color -- blending into the landscaping. We had front yard setbacks that they had to conform to and every time some industry got upset. They went to the Port Commission and said "What is this guy Cogan doing here? Who is he? If we're going to buy the land then we want to be able to operate it the way we want." So, fortunately, Dennis stuck up for our program, and when we opened the door for the Park, the price was \$17,500 an acre.

INTERVIEWER: Hmm.

ARNOLD COGAN: Because industries wanted to come in there. They wanted the recognition, the prestige, of being in a beautiful park like that, an industrial park. So the Port of Portland created Rivergate at the mouth of the Willamette river where it empties in the Columbia. Swan Island was just a 600 acre park, it was the biggest single industrial park around here, but it was 600 acres. Rivergate was 3,000 acres and the Port controlled it all., At that time, Bob Baldwin was the director of the Multnomah County planning commission. Lloyd , my old boss, was still City planning director, so I convened a committee of the three of us, Bob and Lloyd and me, to help chart the future of Rivergate. And we planned it and it was for heavy industry. It was the first time the Port of Portland had thought about -- I mean it's one thing for the kind of light industry you're putting in Swan Island, but for heavy industry, cement plants and steel plants, they're going to have landscaping standards and color standards and noise standards? Yes. Yep. That's what we're going to have. And so we did that. And we got written up in the urban planning magazines at that time and then, as a little favor to Lloyd and Bob, who really wanted a public park. That whole part of Portland, the north Portland peninsula, didn't have a really good park; it had a little one in St. Johns but not much. So we had the idea, well, let's set aside 100 acres at the mouth of the

Willamette, we'll call it Kelley Point Park, and I can't remember who Kelly was anymore, but it was to commemorate some historical figure named Kelly. I should read up in my history I guess, but we set aside, dedicated, and donated it. That was another tough pill for Port to swallow. They said, "You mean we're just going to give it to the County?" It would become a County park because it wasn't in the city yet, so does that mean we'll have to just give it to the county? I said, yeah, yeah, we'll do that. So the idea was, what's in it for us at the Port? I said everybody that comes to this park is going to have to travel through your industrial district. How often does the public come through an industrial district to kind of rubber neck and see what it looks like? Well, zero generally. Maybe somebody if they've lost their way but -- (chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: (Chuckling)

ARNOLD COGAN: -- Joe Public. So we did that and that's what sold them on it -- the public relations part of it. It was attractive. So, we did that. So, that's not traditional land use planning but it was the land use planning that I got involved with. The only other big challenge that I had at the Port was when we created the Hillsboro Airport and the adjacent Hillsboro Industrial Park. It was a private general aviation airport at the time and the Port had an opportunity to acquire it.

INTERVIEWER: So, that -- that's your background coming up to early 70's when --

ARNOLD COGAN: So, here we come -- in 1966, Tom McCall is elected Governor and I wrote another paper about Tom -- in fact, I have it with me, about -- but I didn't think you'd be interested in some of the politics and --- I have a lot of his quotes in there. I loved Tom McCall's quotes. I just really loved the guy. He was the most impressive person I ever worked with. Anyway, so he contacted George Baldwin, who was Manger of the Port at that time. Do you remember George Baldwin?

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

ARNOLD COGAN: He was with the school district for many years.

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm.

ARNOLD COGAN: I think in about 1966 or '65, somewhere in there, he became manager of the Port and he and I worked really close. His son was Greg Baldwin of the same firm that Bob Frasca was in.

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm. Right.

ARNOLD COGAN: Zimmer, Gunsul, Frasca. Earlier, Greg was going to architectural school -- and George wanted me to coach him on becoming a planner, and I think George really wanted him to be a planner, but Bob didn't. So, when Tom McCall was elected and we invited him to a grand opening of the plan for Rivergate, it was -- I mean the Port invited everybody and anybody to the thing, and it was just a big spectacular event, and we invited the Governor. He had just got elected. And I think that's when I first met him. I didn't know him before that, and I met him shortly after that. He invited -- Ed Westerdahl. Do you remember Ed Westerdahl?

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm.

ARNOLD COGAN: He was the Executive Assistant. Tom and Ed invited me to come down to Salem and talk with them. And that's when they told me they had in mind to create a new position of planning in the Governor's office. The department -- Mark Hatfield's pride and joy was the State Department of Planning and Economic Development. Lloyd Anderson was over there and he was the planner in that department. He worked with -- with Sam Malicote at the time. I don't know if these names are familiar to you but, anyway, the plan was persuade the Legislature to move planning out of the Department of Planning and Economic Development and move it into the Governor's Office, which would have left Lloyd without a job. So, they moved it and said they

wanted me to have that planning job. Well, that was kind of irresistible. I was happy at the Port. I loved working for George and doing all these wonderful things that we were doing, but to get an offer from the Governor to head up something like that. So, I asked, what are we going to try to do here, because one of the first things that Tom wanted to get started on, was a state land use planning program. My gosh, that's an interesting idea. I thought that only cities and counties had land use programs. I never thought of states doing land use planning. And I said, well, at first, the state is not going to do the planning but we're going to come up with a codification for cities and counties to do a better job because we have problems with urbanization and farmland and tacky tacky housing out there along the beach. And the Willamette Valley has got all this scrub housing with inadequate utilities. The Governor felt the state is going downhill and fast. He was very passionate about this. And with Ed Westerdahl, who was the master tactician with the legislature, before you knew it they passed the bill and planning was in the Governor's Office and I got a formal offer. So, I had to go in and tell George and he was not happy. He called Tom, because he knew Tom pretty well, and after he was done he said, okay, fine, I'll let you go. So, that's when I began work for the Governor and I had this nice title called Planning Coordinator but then one of the first things we tried to do was to get some land use bills passed in the '69 session of the Legislature. But that was in '69. No, I'm sorry. I'm getting ahead of myself. I beg your pardon. Back to '67.

INTERVIEWER: '67. Right.

ARNOLD COGAN: The Governor was elected in '66 and he took office in '67. And then the bill that transferred Planning Coordinator to his office, it also gave the Governor the title of Chief Planner.

INTERVIEWER: Hmm.

ARNOLD COGAN: And he loved that title. He told me he loved that title better than he liked being Governor. (Chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: (Chuckling)

ARNOLD COGAN: So, at any rate, it gave him these powers -- it didn't give him any extraordinary powers but it gave him powers to develop a planning program for the state. Coincidental to that time, Lyndon Johnson had become president, the great society was starting up, and do you remember block grants?

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

ARNOLD COGAN: Yeah. Block grants were everything. I mean for transportation, schools, libraries, food. I mean there was just no end of the block grants. But to qualify for the block grants, you had to have a plan. So, here I was tasked with the idea of coming up with plans for all those programs because we couldn't get the money otherwise and you not only needed to have a plan, you had to submit that plan to some office in Washington D.C. for approval. So, all of a sudden, I was doing transportation planning and school planning and planning for food and central city planning. I mean, it wasn't detailed planning. It was to come up with up a concept for all those things. Later on, the transportation thing survived with what we know as the comprehensive transportation programs that you see everywhere in just about every major city in the United States. That survived. Some of the other stuff didn't survive too much, but, anyway, we got all of our plans -- it took me awhile but we got those approved, but in the meantime Tom wanted a bill prepared for the '69 session of the legislature, bills I should say, Senate Bills 10, 11, 12 and 13. Do you have any memories of it?

INTERVIEWER: Yep. 10. Right.

ARNOLD COGAN: Yeah. And I was given the job -- Westerdahl was the master tactician as far as lobbying. So, he gave me some pointers and he said, Arnold, you're going to be the lobbyist for these four bills for the legislature and we're going to divide everybody in the Governor's office up among the legislators. There's only about eight -- nine or ten people in the Governor's office. Today they've got 20 or 30 people but they only had about, at the most, 10. So, each of us had about 10 legislators that we had to follow all around and indoctrinate them about the value of these four bills. Unfortunately, L.B. Day -- do you remember L.B. Day?

INTERVIEWER: L.B. Day. Certainly.

ARNOLD COGAN: Republican. Labor leader. I had a hard time squaring that away. (chuckling) In my mind L.B. was basically a bully. That's how he got everything done. But he was quite a horse trader and Tom thought L.B. was a master in the legislature and -- I don't know if he was in the House or the Senate, but anyway he was given the job of carrying those four bills that were on the floor and so I was supposed to work with L.B. That's how I first got acquainted with L.B. And by the end of the session, L.B. asked for a meeting with the Governor and me. He said, Governor, I can guarantee you that we will pass 10, but we can't get 11, 12 and 13 through. We're going to lose them. I found out later L.B. had traded them away for other goodies that he wanted.

INTERVIEWER: For the record, 11, 12 and 13 dealt with?

ARNOLD COGAN: Well, I should have that memorized, but I'm sorry, I don't have key details.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah. Okay.

ARNOLD COGAN: Well, but -- I can tell you, collectively, what they dealt with.

INTERVIEWER: Okay.

ARNOLD COGAN: Collectively, they dealt with infrastructure, they dealt with lot sizes, and platting and so forth. And they dealt with -- one was a bill to authorize soil classification studies at Oregon State University.

INTERVIEWER: Water?

ARNOLD COGAN: They were a big help to the land use program there at Oregon State. It dealt with Agricultural and the Rural programs-- I can't remember the guy's name at OSU.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah.

ARNOLD COGAN: We dealt with him very closely. Anyway, they were very -- 11, 12 and 13 were very specific pieces like that. 10 was kind of the omnibus. It was the one that set up the idea of planning. It required cities and counties to have a comprehensive plan. You had to have a plan by 1971. Not very much time. Two years. In fact, it wasn't even two years because this was the '69 session and by the time the bill was passed, it was late in the session. -- so in the final analysis we got 10 passed. Lost the other three. As I told somebody -- so much for my career as a lobbyist! (Chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: (Chuckling) Well, you weren't alone.

ARNOLD COGAN: I mean, I was really outclassed, especially by L.B., and -- but 10 was enough to get a foothold. The only problem with 10, you may recall, it did require these comprehensive plans by '71, but it had no teeth to it. It didn't say what will happen if you don't have it. I mean there was no enforcement. There was nothing. It just said you should do it. Like it's good for you. You should do it. And a lot of good reason -- and we had all kinds of reasons why it was good but there was -- there was no enforcement.

INTERVIEWER: It was kind of like a seed that was planted.

ARNOLD COGAN: It was the seed.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah.

ARNOLD COGAN: Well, when Tom finally realized that it was a nice idea, but it wasn't going to go anywhere, and then by this time he was already campaigning for his second term, and he said, by God, we're going to pass a strong land use bill that not only sets out what's supposed to be done but it's got teeth to it. It's got enforcement power to it. And so then we began work -- and that was when -- when Larry Halperin was hired to do the coloring book of the Willamette Valley and a whole program of public support around the state for what later became Senate Bill 100. Actually Senate Bill 100 and 101. Do you remember 101?

INTERVIEWER: That's the agricultural part.

ARNOLD COGAN: Yes. Okay. So -- (clearing throat) Pardon me. Talking too long here. So here comes Senate Bill 100 and that was intense lobbying to get that done, but it wasn't just relying on little ole Arnold. I mean, we had quite an army by then and Tom had already started working with Henry Richmond to organize 1000 Friends. Those were the early days, plus there was a whole bunch of other people. It was a bipartisan program with Ted Hallock on the democratic side and Hector MacPherson down in Linn County, who really carried the heavy water on this one on getting the bill passed, but Ted was a huge help-- do you remember Ted Hallock?

INTERVIEWER: Hallock? Yes.

ARNOLD COGAN: Yeah. He was a big important part of it. He helped discipline the democrats in the two houses and Hector did his work on a number of Republicans and so that was the time when we had real bipartisan support and cooperation. I mean they actually talked to each other. Can you imagine that?

INTERVIEWER: (Chuckling) Not in today's environment.

ARNOLD COGAN: And Tom got along with both sides. In fact, he had really close friends on the Democratic side, and so that there were some Republicans who were not in favor of the program. They took a lot of persuading, and not all of them were persuaded, but we got a good majority to approve 100, and that was really the beginning of the program, I mean, when it got started in '73. And so shortly after that, I was hired to head up at that agency. A little footnote. One of the first things I did, as the legislature was still in session, I tried to get a budget for staff. They somehow overlooked the staff.

INTERVIEWER: (Chuckling)

ARNOLD COGAN: They go, well, Arnold, we've got you there and we've got -- there's enough money for an executive assistant. Do you need something else? And -- (chuckling) So, I laid out a budget for about 21 people and -- to work on regional programs and to work on specific categories, the land use part, the public involvement part, and so on and so forth, and -- and even the 21 was kind of skimpy. Well, the legislature, in its infinite wisdom, I think, gave us enough budget for nine people at that time, which was just hopeless. So, then we started trying to stir up volunteers. That's when we came up with the Citizen Involvement Advisory Committee, which survives to this day, the CIAC. In fact, there's a senior person in our consulting firm who's the chair of that committee now. So, he comes to me with questions all the time about the land use program but he's chair of that. I thought, I think that's wonderful that -- I mean the thing is surviving today and the -- and then, of course, we -- the commission itself and then we had a group of -- of technical people, uh, Steve Schell, who was vice-chair, yeah, and then, wouldn't you know it, L.B. became chair, I had him as a boss there, and the then Steve was vice-chair, and Steve volunteered to marshal a whole bunch of professional volunteers, other lawyers, plus engineers, agronomists and demographers. I mean a whole bunch of technical people to help us write the

goals because that was our first assignment. All we had to start with was a list of titles for each goal like Citizen Involvement, Land Use Planning and so forth, Agricultural, et cetera, et cetera, but other than the title and a nice sentence describing what the title meant, we didn't have anything. We had to write those goals. And at first, people had a hard time trying to appreciate it. If you can imagine at the time, goals didn't sound like really what it is we really wanted. We needed to codify the process by which cities were going to prepare comprehensive plans. I mean it was much more than just a lofty goal. It had to be, you know, nuts and bolts of what had to be done.

INTERVIEWER: Something that you could enforce since you had the authority.

ARNOLD COGAN: Exactly. And you'd know it if you'd have the enforcement tools to know whether you measured up or you didn't measure up to it.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah.

ARNOLD COGAN: Yeah. So, we went all over the state. Do you remember those workshops that we had around the state?

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

ARNOLD COGAN: We had over 100 workshops. Three rounds of workshops. About 30 to 35 workshops at each round. I never saw so much of Oregon before until I went on those trips. I went on every one of them. And we had to divide the staff -- our little staff into two because we had rented these little rental jeeps or trailers. It kind of preceded the SUV's we have today, but, anyway, they were just little jitney's or something so we could load it up with easels and questionnaires and all kinds of stuff to take to these places. We also took volunteers from the CIAC and some of those technical people that Steve Schell had marshaled. So, we always had someone, two or three technical people, our own staff, maybe two or three, and two or three citizens -- just

ordinary citizens going to each meeting all over the state. And this was the age before internet and the web and all that stuff.

INTERVIEWER: Email.

ARNOLD COGAN: So, how did we contact people? We used the US mail, I mean that's all we had, and we printed out -- there were about a million people on the registered voters list at that time and we decided we had budget only for about mailing of 10 percent of those. So, we had a randomized selection of 100,000 names, out of a million, and we kept changing it every time we had a meeting. We sent out five versions of this paper and we called the paper, "People and the Land". We borrowed that phrase from one of McCall's speeches. He coined it. And because what he was trying to get at was balance. It was not just about land. It was not just about people. It was about the economy and the agriculture and it was about recreation and environment, people and the land. So, we called the paper that. We sent out 100,000 copies of that five times and we varied the list. So, we re-randomized it each time so the same person didn't get all five copies. And in the paper we told them what we learned at our first round of meetings, we told them what the goal was supposed to accomplish, we printed out some of the stuff we selected from the workshops that we had. Did you go to any of those workshops?

INTERVIEWER: I attended one that I recall. Yeah.

ARNOLD COGAN: Um hmm. Yeah. There's a lot of people around today of our vintage who remember those workshops because they generally went really well. And they could remember that we asked a lot of questions. You know, like what do you like about this part of the state? What do you have to be done to protect it and preserve it? We asked people over in Bend, "What do you like about the coast?" And if we were on the coast, we asked people, "What do you think about the Bend area and Pendleton and Klamath Falls?" So, that we got a mixture of ideas

from different parts of the state. And then we went back to the office and digested all this stuff and we categorized it under all the goal titles and it began to take shape. By the time we went out the second time, we had a rough draft of the goals and we went to another 30 places around the state. Some of them were the same. In Portland, for example, we had three meetings in the valley. I think we had three sets of meetings for Portland, Salem, Eugene, Medford. And as we -- as we had these meetings, more and more people were coming to these meetings all the time. We generally had no less than 100 people. Some meetings we had as many as 250 people.

INTERVIEWER: That's impressive.

ARNOLD COGAN: And some of the better attended meetings were away from Portland, you know?

INTERVIEWER: Arnold, I'd like --

ARNOLD COGAN: I should give you -- I'll give you a chance to beep in.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah. I want to capture one thing before we get too far beyond --

ARNOLD COGAN: Yes.

INTERVIEWER: -- it. When you were talking about the title "People and the Land" and you talked a little bit about the multiple issues that you've dealt with, one of the things that's been impressive to me in looking at Senate Bill 100 is the fact that comprehensive plan is the single term that has a long-detailed definition for it.

ARNOLD COGAN: Um hmm. Um hmm.

INTERVIEWER: And what I make of that is that comprehensiveness was one of the buy words for the program.

ARNOLD COGAN: Um hmm.

INTERVIEWER: And I'm interested in your -- kind of continue what you said, your reflection upon the role that comprehensiveness, that the discipline that was required that of the program in establishing the goals and administering them, the discipline of looking at the hard tradeoffs between different values represented in the goals, forestland versus wetlands, or the ag land versus urban land, --

ARNOLD COGAN: Um hmm.

INTERVIEWER: -- efficient transportation services versus density of housing and development.

ARNOLD COGAN: Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: But can you reflect upon that comprehensiveness aspect a little bit?

ARNOLD COGAN: And that -- and that's an interesting question because that level of comprehensiveness was different from what most planning schools taught. I know when I went to work for Lloyd Keefe, we talked about the comprehensive plan in Portland. We worked on that. The comprehensive plan of Portland, or any other city in the United States, was generally comprehensive in terms of encompassing the municipal responsibilities that a city had for establishing classifications for different kinds of land, farms, industrial land, recreational land, commercial land, residential of course, and so it was primarily in terms of the comprehensiveness that a municipality would normally encounter. Well, that was important to the state program, but comprehensiveness, as you point out, was much, much more than that. Then we got into forestland. We had to get into all kinds of other types of land forms and land decisions that would have been far beyond what the typical comprehensive city plan, the Portland plan, or Salem plan or whatever, might be including. So, it was a much, much broader definition. So, it was very important that people understood that at the state level.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah. I think it's kind of informative, in that context. Your illustration of that asking people in Bend to comment on the coast.

ARNOLD COGAN: Um hmm.

INTERVIEWER: People on the coast to comment on Portland or on whatever. So, you know, that kind power, I would think, in opening people's mind to see their particular location or involvement in the context of something else within the state in the bigger context. Something almost the opposite of their experience.

ARNOLD COGAN: That's right.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah.

ARNOLD COGAN: Yeah. Much, much broader than the typical experience of most people in cities. Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: So, I take it from your kind of enthusiastic description of that citizen involvement, outreach effort that you've been describing, that you found that whole experience productive and useful in the shaping of the program as we know it?

ARNOLD COGAN: Yeah. Well, very much so and I think that because of the public involvement program -- well, I think, for several reasons, the -- the state land use program endured over the years. You may recall there were three measures, ballot measures, in the late 70's, early 80's, to do away with the program altogether. Just cancel it. And I'm convinced that the combination of those workshops that we had all over the state, and whether you attended a workshop or not, it was well publicized, people were aware of the fact that the LCDC show was in town and that it was here and they wanted your opinions and it was in the paper. We saw too that the news of the meeting was publicized and after the meeting that reporters were there and they wrote the stories of ours. So, people became very aware that we weren't just sitting in Salem

writing this program. So, they were pretty well-persuaded that this was a people's program. That was part of it. The other part of it, Goal 1 being Citizen Involvement, laid out very clearly what had to be done when these comprehensive plans were prepared. And so I think people knew that they owned this program. And so I wasn't surprised, there were a lot of people that were not surprised, that those three ballot measures failed miserably to eliminate the program.

INTERVIEWER: Well, that effort and once the goals were formed into a document, and they were put out for adoption, there was even more citizen involvement effort going on at that point or outreached in the process.

ARNOLD COGAN: Um hmm.

INTERVIEWER: So, there were a lot of interest groups and non-profit organizations and state agencies and local governments that worked into the mix of discussing and commenting on those prospective goals. Can you highlight some of the actors in that?

ARNOLD COGAN: Well, I certainly can. Because I think of the extreme -- I don't know if I'd call it left or right but Henry Richmond was very active. He had the full cooperation with Tom McCall. In fact, Tom was one of the co-signers and creators of 1000 Friends. Bill Moshofsky was on the other side. And, yeah, and he's not the only one.

INTERVIEWER: Identify Bill Moshofsky for the tape.

ARNOLD COGAN: Oh, Bill Moshofsky -- I first met Bill when I was doing my lobbying, so to speak, for the first bill, and Bill Moshofsky was -- he was the lobbyist for Georgia Pacific --

INTERVIEWER: Yeah. Yeah.

ARNOLD COGAN: -- at the time and Georgia Pacific was vigorously opposed to anything called statewide land use planning. Absolutely opposed to it. It just smacks of communism and fascism and anything else you want to use for an adjective. So, he was opposed to

it from day one. So, I had to constantly cope with Moshofsky and, unfortunately, he was a very articulate individual. He presented himself well. He was a nice guy basically. Aside from this little one aberration of his he was a really nice guy. I really --

INTERVIEWER: Very avid about it.

ARNOLD COGAN: I kind of liked him as an individual but, boy, did we lock horns repeatedly on this. And then, of course, he was able pull in a lot of people in business, the Associated Oregon Industries, do you remember them?

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm. Yes.

ARNOLD COGAN: They were a powerhouse of a group. And I'm trying to think of what other statewide groups like that dredge them up and, of course, on Henry's side the more liberal organizations, the League of Women Voters. Of course, they were very supportive and other environmental groups. The Oregon Environmental Council and Larry Williams, who had a vote in the Environmental Council, he was very articulate. And those were the kinds of groups. So, I had to constantly deal -- like one -- I don't know how much time you want to take but one little --

INTERVIEWER: We've got a little more time.

ARNOLD COGAN: One little sideline of Bill Moshofsky, when I left DLCD -- pardon me, (clearing throat) when I left DLCD and we started our consulting firm, my wife, Elaine and I did, shortly after that, I got a call Saturday morning at about 8 o'clock in the morning, and I think we were sleeping at the time, it's Bill Moshofsky. Hi Arnold. I didn't wake you up, I hope? I said, well, yeah, you did. But is it all -- sorry, but anyway, I've got a bunch of us, we're down here at our office here at Georgia Pacific, we've got a problem. We'd like your help. And Georgia Pacific has a big pulp mill down on the coast in Toledo, just east of Newport.

The Yaquina River comes in from Newport right by the mill. Bill says, we've got a plant there and this doctor from Salem has purchased 100 acres on the opposite side of the river and it's sloped toward the river and our plant. So, here's the mill over here and this slope is -- it looks right at the plant and it's zoned for an acre per lot.

INTERVIEWER: Uh, yes. I remember about that.

ARNOLD COGAN: But he is petitioning to the Toledo planning commission to change it to put four units per lot, which means there could be 400 housing units up on that hill. He says, I don't think that's right. So they asked me. Do you think that's right? I said I can't judge just from what you told me, Bill. He said I'd like to hire you. Can I hire you?

INTERVIEWER: (Chuckling)

ARNOLD COGAN: Bill says he's on the side of land use planning now. He said I want to make this work.

INTERVIEWER: Made a believer out of him.

ARNOLD COGAN: I thought that was -- I mean, I just couldn't help but chuckle about the whole irony of that.

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

ARNOLD COGAN: Yeah. But, anyway, I don't want to get into a sideline detail but I thought it was kind of interesting.

INTERVIEWER: In the context of the comprehensiveness that we've talked about, are there specific goals that you think have been more critical, more important than others, in the development of comprehensive plans.

ARNOLD COGAN: Well, I mean, I mentioned public involvement. I think that is -- I don't want to say it's the most critical, but I think it's an extremely important goal. Maybe the

most important goal. The second one, land use planning, has to be a part of it because it describes the importance of land use planning.

INTERVIEWER: That's Goal 2.

ARNOLD COGAN: And then agriculture and -- I mean those two -- so they kind of work together and -- citizen involvement and land use planning, and then agriculture and forestry. So, they kind of form a sequence of importance. Jumping to the next one that I think is very important is Goal 14, which lays out the whole concept of urbanization introducing the subject of urban growth boundaries, which I think is probably the saving of the program. It may be one thing to prepare good comprehensive plans, really not only to say good in the majority, I'm talking about excellent comprehensive plans, have them do all they're supposed to do, fulfilling all the goals, but without Goal 14, without those urban growth boundaries, we wouldn't have the salvage of not just the Willamette Valley, but all of Oregon. To be able to preserve farm and forestland, important natural resources, scenic areas, and contain the growth. And so -- and I think they've performed admirably. There's a lot of debates about should -- should they be more liberal or less? So, in certain locations I had my viewpoints on that, but I think that, by and large, I think that Goal 14 has helped to create the longevity of the land use program and the continued importance of the program and then you can add on the group of coastal goals, which came on later. When we were doing our work, the coastal program was a separate program at that time.

INTERVIEWER: Yes. Uh huh.

ARNOLD COGAN: -- OCCDC, but then we succeeded in merging the coastal program with the rest of it. So, we've got the full set of 19 goals now and so I don't know if I would want to articulate the importance of any others. I think they're all --

INTERVIEWER: Well, I'm reminded by your comments of the interview with Maggie Collins, who had been involved with the League of Women Voters at the get go, and was reflecting a similar view as yours about citizen involvement, but she went on then to pause at that Goal 3, Agriculture, and Goal 14, the Urban Growth Boundaries, were the two substantive pillars in the planning program.

ARNOLD COGAN: Yeah. I wouldn't disagree with that. I mean, yeah, I think that's a good observation.

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

ARNOLD COGAN: Yeah. And I think that it's because it's Goal 14 that helps make Goal 3 activated.

INTERVIEWER: So, when you were going through all of this early activity, and I think it's really been instructive to get your prior Senate Bill 100 experience at the Port, the extent to which the kind of things that you and your colleagues were doing at the Port, in the plans that were being developed, forming a lot of the grist for the mill, if you will, as people, the Governor and others started contemplating statewide planning program. So, given your involvement at that point what kind of hopes or expectations when you started getting into Senate Bill 100 and forming the goals and so forth --

ARNOLD COGAN: Uh hmm.

INTERVIEWER: -- what kind of hopes and expectations did you have for the state's planning program?

ARNOLD COGAN: Well, I think that it's kind of interesting. I think the hopes were basically fulfilled with the creation of the goals and then the review of that first round of plans, obviously it took more than two years to get every community to finally conform to the goals, it

was -- I think it was 10 years or something of that sort? Maybe more. I've lost track of how many years it took, but it took a lot of them a while. We needed time and I think that once that was done then it became on the backs of the commission to enforce the program and to ensure that it continued to perform according to the original goals and the rules that were promulgated along with it. So, I think -- and I'm not sure that answers your question. I think that they -- I think that the program has performed as it was intended to perform. I think there's more work to be done that wasn't intended or even anticipated but I think that's after 40 years that one would expect that -- that new issues would crop up and there'd be new needs and requirements.

INTERVIEWER: Can you offer some specifics?

ARNOLD COGAN: Yes. (Chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: (Chuckling)

ARNOLD COGAN: I can.

INTERVIEWER: I thought you would.

ARNOLD COGAN: I can. Yes. In looking at the program today, I mean, I think -- for example, citizen involvement, there's no question about it, it's still relevant, people still need to be involved, but how do they get involved? Today is very different from, of course, 40 years ago. We didn't have the web and we didn't have the whole system of -- I mean the technology is such that US Mail can't be the final resort, although I think some places still resort to US Mail as their principal notification. And I think that it's time that planning agencies go on line and figure out how to use it better, how to be more creative about it, and I think there's a lot more that can be done to inform citizens and keep people up to date, maybe have an electronic newsletter or some kind of an update periodically. I mean you take a look at other organizations, particularly commercial organizations, that rely on the net to advise people about what they've got. I mean

there's a lot available there. And I think it would be good for planning commissions and planning agencies to start looking at that. So, I think just to take citizen involvement and take it to where we are in the 21st Century or where we should be in the 21st Century.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah. You know, it comes to mind that your description of the workshops and the citizen involvement efforts that you went through at the get go and how important that was as a background to get people to buy in and -- and in subsequent years to vote down ballot measures that would eliminate the program.

ARNOLD COGAN: Yeah. Right.

INTERVIEWER: So, you build a constituency and I guess the kind of the question that comes to mind is, "Are we at a point in the 21st Century now where that constituency needs to be freshened up? Enlivened again?"

ARNOLD COGAN: Yeah. Absolutely. I mean, I think it's a much more complicated world obviously. We've all grown up into it so it isn't as if we were Rip Van Winkle and we suddenly woke up and said, oh, my gosh, where did all this come from. I mean there's a lot more available. I mean, I can just think of something personal. My wife and I live up in the Mr. Tabor area, there's a big kerfuffle going on about the Mt. Tabor reservoirs and, in fact, I think there's a meeting tonight or tomorrow night, and the city council is having a meeting. So, meetings still occur. Everything isn't on the web. I mean meetings still occur, and people show up, and complain or are given opportunities to say something. So, I think it's a combination of taking advantage of the technology that's available, as well as coming up with techniques for dealing with people who come to meetings and for collecting ideas and having those ideas digested by decision-makers and come up with their mind made up on what to do. So, I think there's a lot more that can be done

creatively to involve citizens, give them the recognition, and still give policy makers and elected officials the rights and opportunity they need to make decisions.

INTERVIEWER: You know there are some provisions of these -- the statutes, Senate Bill 100 --

ARNOLD COGAN: Um hmm.

INTERVIEWER: -- that probably have gotten less play over the years, uh, periodic review, uh, special districts or the role for special districts, state agencies. There's a function of activities of statewide significance that hasn't had a lot of play. I was pointing to some of these other provisions of the statute.

ARNOLD COGAN: Yes. Yeah. These is so many side shows that are going to keep coming up and I think that -- I don't mean to diminish them, I mean they're important issues statewide, and issues of statewide significance and so have to be considered. I mean, they need to be brought into the program and creative ways need to be found to weave those into the process so that we don't subvert the process that's already been set up with the goals and guidelines, but do we have any way to bring them together and so that isn't one versus the other of statewide significance. Gee, if we do that, what are we going to do for the rest of the program? The world gets more complicated and we need to find ways to be able to weave all of this together. I think that we should be open to these kinds of opportunities. I have one issue that -- back to urban growth boundaries. The last legislative session, do you remember the grand bargaining that the legislature imposed --

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm.

ARNOLD COGAN: -- on Washington County with that urban growth boundary change? Now, I think that was an unnecessarily arbitrary imposition of state legislative will on local

decision-making, that's my opinion, and I think that there could have been a much more elegant-- how can I say that, a much more elegant way to have done that without the legislature coming in and being the big brown bear pouncing over everybody else and saying this is what you're going to do. We'll call it a grand bargaining. It's a nice name. Right?

INTERVIEWER: Right. Yeah.

ARNOLD COGAN: Yeah. So I think that there ought to be a more -- maybe a more aggressive, perhaps, way of standing up either by LCDC or by the citizens or by the Governor or some -- someone. I think that maybe a citizen's group. 1000 Friends, I know, is opposed to that but I think this is a -- this was a race -- 1000 Friends versus the state legislature -- it was easy to put your money on who's going to win that race? (Chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: Yeah. (Chuckling)

ARNOLD COGAN: So, I mean, there was no competition, but I think there should have been more competition and somehow we need to set up some mechanisms to be able to handle it. There are other challenges too. I don't know if you want to get into other challenges.

INTERVIEWER: Well, sure.

ARNOLD COGAN: But I mean climate change. Climate change I think there's an issue. I don't see studies about climate change. Our consulting firm has been involved in a number of climate change studies, but I'm not sure to what extent climate change is being integrated into comprehensive plans. Maybe it is. I just haven't been following it that close, and I'll confess that I have not been making it my business to examine comprehensive plans and says, well, where's climate change? But my sense is it's not a serious element of the -- of the plan.

INTERVIEWER: In our conversation, before starting the interview, we talked a little bit about demographic forecasts for Oregon and it tied --

ARNOLD COGAN: Um hmm. Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: It was tied in with climate change.

ARNOLD COGAN: Um hmm.

INTERVIEWER: That as climate change exacerbates, the migration from the south that can be anticipated, will have a --

ARNOLD COGAN: Um hmm. Yes.

INTERVIEWER: -- serious impact on the state of Oregon.

ARNOLD COGAN: That's right. It's another -- it's another aspect. I was mentioning the paper that Nohad Toulan and I authored just two years ago, I mean, it was the year he passed away, but earlier that year -- in fact a number of years before that year, he and I had written several papers about the problem that Oregon is going to face when climate refuges, which is a subject I know that Ethan Seltzer and some people here at PSU have been studying, climate refuges begin to invade the -- not just Oregon but the northern states --

INTERVIEWER: Yeah. Right.

ARNOLD COGAN: -- and Oregon is going to be one of the recipients of that immigration and it's going to be gradually increasing, assuming we don't take the steps that need to be taken to forestall climate change, we're going to be getting these people moving here. It's going to swell the population figures, particularly in the Willamette Valley, and Nohad, as I had mentioned during our earlier conversation, was a part-time demographer. He loved demography and he charted the population of the Willamette Valley over the past 150 years and -- and discovered that about 80 percent of Oregon's populations always settled in the Willamette Valley. So, that you can -- and it's pretty darn close to that number, and it was true 100 years ago, and it's true today. And what we were talking about was 50 years or 100 years from now it's probably still going to be true. And

so what do we do about that? Is the Willamette Valley capable of carrying a population of five or six million at the middle of the century or close to 10 million or more at the end of the century, and are those urban growth boundaries designed to contain that? You know, there's only so much you can grow up, versus out, which is the conventional wisdom of the two choices available, that's what Metro's been dealing with, and I would guess that up is going up into high rises or multi-story apartment houses, some people are willing to do that but not everybody, and single family homes still are going to continue to be desired and that's going to put a lot of pressure on the urban growth boundaries. What happens when Portland's urban growth boundary starts pushing up against Wilsonville's and Lake Oswego's and those start pressing up against, uh, what's north of Salem? I don't know.

INTERVIEWER: Woodburn.

ARNOLD COGAN: Woodburn. There you go. Start pressing -- so they all start pressing into each other and we end up achieving this saturated growth through the Willamette Valley that we wanted to avoid when we first created Senate Bill 100. And so, I mean, I think, there's more that needs to be done on that front and what we were proposing, It's not new, because that's what I headed up when I first started working for Tom, but it quickly evaporated -- when Atiyeh became Governor and it was long forgotten and then never restored again. It may be still on the books. I've never checked to see, is it still in the books or what, but at any rate it would be -- it wouldn't be too much of a trick to find that out and to -- and if it isn't on the books and re-pass that idea to create a state planning office, not to do the planning that cities and counties are supposed to do. That's pretty well codified in their doing it, but as a state interest, the state vision, what is the vision of the state with that kind of a population pressure? And should we be creating a new town someplace? Should we be looking at Woodburn, not to pick on Woodburn, should we look at

Woodburn, maybe liberalize the urban growth boundary, and get them to be a city of a larger scale. And is that something in Woodburn and other areas that's in the state's interest to do? I don't think anybody's thinking about the long-term impacts of large population growth in the Willamette Valley.

INTERVIEWER: And perhaps and including a look at that kind of population growth vis-à-vis food supply, water and --

ARNOLD COGAN: Yeah. Sure. All of that. And I think that it ties in with all the goals and I think it would be within the spirit of all the goals themselves to be thinking about a new approach to state planning that doesn't subvert or replace city and county planning but it could potentially enhance it if we had something like that.

INTERVIEWER: That strikes me in looking back at the formation of -- well, looking back at the assignment of the urban growth boundary in the Portland area to a regional entity, because it didn't make sense for 27 cities in the greater Portland area to each have a separate boundary, kind of stuff so that -- it seems like you were saying there are some critical issues in our midst and our future, where we need that kind of state planning because the issues surpass in importance and in scale individual cities' ability to deal with it.

ARNOLD COGAN: Yeah. Well, that's an interesting point because as you know in the metropolitan area, Metro is the guardian of the UGB --

INTERVIEWER: Right.

ARNOLD COGAN: -- on behalf of all the cities. Each city is supposed to maintain its own, but there's a regional growth boundary that is supposed to be maintained, well, that's what the legislature, in its infinite wisdom of the grand bargain, subverted.

INTERVIEWER: Arnold, I'd like your perspective on another aspect of that. Let me preface that with a quick question about the demographics that you were referring to with Nohad. If 80 percent of the growth in the state goes to the valley, Willamette Valley, did he do anything to look at the percentage of that Willamette Valley growth that went into urban areas as opposed to the rural areas?

ARNOLD COGAN: No. No. I mean, we didn't do that but that --

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

ARNOLD COGAN: -- would have been -- that's a logical refinement. That's good addition to the concept.

INTERVIEWER: Because my guess would be that it might be right around the 80 percent mark again --

INTERVIEWER: Um hmm.

ARNOLD COGAN: -- the population coming into the valley that's settles in the urban areas. That would be consistent with what happens across the country.

ARNOLD COGAN: I'm sure.

INTERVIEWER: Most of the migration is to cities not -- not that --

ARNOLD COGAN: Sure. I'm sure of that.

INTERVIEWER: Which highlights, it seems to me, the question about the amount of our time and resource that goes into trying to intensify redevelopment and infill development within an urban growth boundary, over against tinkering with the -- the boundary itself because it seems like -- it seems like if you take water and food and other issues, like transportation into question, we're not going to benefit ourselves by paving over the Willamette Valley.

ARNOLD COGAN: Um hmm.

INTERVIEWER: There's going to have to be the elevation in infill, redevelopment activity, and that can be really creative -- as we see in parts of the region, but too little was being done it seems like it.

ARNOLD COGAN: Yeah. There's an interesting article that just came out in the -- which edition, June 21st, the Sunday edition of the Oregonian.

INTERVIEWER: Hmm.

ARNOLD COGAN: You may have seen this. "Time to Talk about the Cost of Living". And in here -- I'll give it to you, in here there's a piece where, you know, what's increasing the cost of living? It's population increase. And land use planning is restricting it and making it more expensive to buy a home.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah.

ARNOLD COGAN: See why land use planning needs to catch up here with the last line, "Lowering the cost of living is a difficult task. No one expects quick solutions. It would be nice if the problem at least got more attention." And then somewhere else it mentions about land use planning being necessary to start thinking about what role does land use planning play in making the cost of living more affordable? So, I mean, I think it's not in a test tube or isolated, land use planning is, from everything else in modern life.

INTERVIEWER: Well, we're hitting the --

ARNOLD COGAN: I mean, we didn't -- we didn't talk about sustainability. We didn't talk about the whole matter of sustainability. That was another one on my list but -- (chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: Well, though, if you -- do you have a quick comment on that? We've got a couple minutes here yet.

ARNOLD COGAN: Well, I mean, it's just to the idea that today's living requires a performance of sustainability more than what we've had to worry about in the past. Yes. Sure we have the bottle bill, and we've got conservation of gasoline, and so forth but I think that the whole concept of driving, using gas, again it gets into climate change, these issues are all interchanged with each other. The whole subject of a more sustainable urban life is something that we haven't really thought or talked about enough. I mean I think it would be worthwhile. To what extent it fits into thinking about where's the land use program going next, but I wouldn't want to see it left out? How could it be included as a subject or an issue that deserved some attention?

INTERVIEWER: Well, it's very helpful that you point out some of the things like sustainability and climate change, et cetera, because they're kind of the new frontiers, if you will, of successful planning --

ARNOLD COGAN: Um hmm.

INTERVIEWER: -- in developing livability for the state of Oregon.

ARNOLD COGAN: Exactly.

INTERVIEWER: Yeah.

ARNOLD COGAN: Yeah. So, I think it's closely intertwined with something as old-fashioned and familiar as just plain old land use planning. But land use planning isn't just a plain old concept any more. I mean, I think it takes on a new significance.

INTERVIEWER: So, is Arnold Cogan ready to embark on a new statewide series of workshops dealing with climate change and sustainability?

ARNOLD COGAN: Sure. I'd be happy to do that.

INTERVIEWER: (Chuckling)

ARNOLD COGAN: I'd be happy to do that. (Chuckling)

INTERVIEWER: Are there other comments before we conclude that you would like to offer?

ARNOLD COGAN: Hmm. The other word I've got down here regionalism. Part of the problem with -- from outside of metro, I mean, metro, of course, is a specific state-mandated region.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

ARNOLD COGAN: For the most part it isn't -- I think it isn't successfully dealt with in a straight-forward way as part of the land use planning program. It certainly isn't part of the goals. And cities and within their counties are treated as just individual entities regardless of what kind of regions there are now. The Portland metropolitan area is a logical one but there are other logical ones beginning to form now. Certainly in the Eugene area. Lane County, which was already started, it's the Lane County region, and the Lane County -- Lane Council of Governments is what - - was what we always had. Willamette Valley Council of Governments. At least they had more than one city and more than one county, but I think we pretty much got rid of those councils of governments and those regional entities, but I think more and more, particularly, as we get the climate refuges, it's all intertwined, but I think that the regionalism could become a more important aspect of our land use planning then we've had up until now.

INTERVIEWER: So, was it 10-12 years after the metro UGB was established that metro developed a regional plan that called for a station area planning and regional cities within the region, and the importance of a central city? There were some great concepts imbedded within that plan.

ARNOLD COGAN: Yeah.

INTERVIEWER: What seemed to be missing was a concerted effort to come up with the tools to achieve the things that they identified as important for a well-integrated region.

ARNOLD COGAN: Um hmm.

INTERVIEWER: So, how do you get at the question of a more successful timely redevelopment, infill development, mixed use development activity?

ARNOLD COGAN: How do you do that within a regional context you mean?

INTERVIEWER: Yes. Yeah.

ARNOLD COGAN: Yeah. Well, I think there are all kinds of techniques for doing that.

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

ARNOLD COGAN: But I don't think there's any particular secret or new techniques that have been discovered. We've got national organizations that deal with regions and help regions to -- to plan and to function and I think we certainly have enough capability in the state here to do that. I know the University of Oregon, the planning school, has been doing some work in that regard. I'm not sure what's being done here at Portland State, as far as regional planning is concerned. But I know Ethan is interested in it, because I talked with him about it, and so I think that there's enough interest and technique and motivation to get that moving.

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

ARNOLD COGAN: And, besides, again, how everything -- demonstration of how everything is connected to everything else, this concept that -- that Nohad and I were talking about really requires a regional approach to it.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

ARNOLD COGAN: Because you can't do it just with cities alone --

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

ARNOLD COGAN: -- and you certainly wouldn't do it either by cities or a state as a whole. You've got to do it by regions.

INTERVIEWER: Right.

ARNOLD COGAN: And that -- that would be the only sensible way to -- to make it work.

INTERVIEWER: One last -- one last call. (Chuckling)

ARNOLD COGAN: (Chuckling) Any -- that was your last question. Any other thoughts, anecdotes or experiences. I think I pretty well have shot the wad here in the -- well, back to the public involvement. I see I had a few thoughts here about citizen involvement. What I didn't mention was that there are many groups who don't have a significant enough voice. I mean we're certainly conscious of the neighborhood organizations, and special purpose organizations, 1000 Friends, and so forth, but there are lots of groups, elderly groups, rural groups, economically disadvantaged groups, I'm not sure to what extent -- I don't see too often where that is a noticeable aspect of what the public wants. It usually is who's yelling the loudest and who's got the most articulate spokesman and who's got the best prepared materials but that generally doesn't include these groups.

INTERVIEWER: Yes.

ARNOLD COGAN: So, I think that that would be a help to furthering the whole concept of public involvement.

INTERVIEWER: Well, we've been speaking today with Arnold Cogan, the first Director of the Department of Land Conservation and Development. Arnold, it's been a pleasure and it's been very informative and I'm glad we got at least a little bit of that 'per square inch information' that I know is embedded in your history. So, thank you, very much.

ARNOLD COGAN: Happy to have done it. I enjoyed talking with you. Yeah. It's been very nice.

INTERVIEWER: Yes. Thank you.

ARNOLD COGAN: I appreciate it.

(Concluded)